

Comments from 05/19/04

Victor Zavala – 806 East Park; Mayfield Park Association

Mobility, Drainage, Public Safety can be....

Should not allow development to negatively impact Burney Road

Should keep commercial/industrial along State Highway 6

Residential should be single family

Imperial Sugar property is historic and could be cultural use

Natalie Stackable – 1418 Vickery Drive

Open space/natural areas

Mary Joyce – 13820 Placid Woods; Sugar Mill

Development shouldn't burden Burney Road

Would like a specific public hearing meeting relating to Burney Road Bypass

No apartments/ live work townhomes

Redevelopment and preservation of Sugar Factory

Use Economic Development Target Study as a guide for commercial industrial areas

Would like to see establishment of Overlay Zones to have more control over aesthetics, buffering, greenspace and natural areas

Karen Dean

Area Six

mixed use residential with a PD is a concept currently proposed

Riverstone has townhomes

Would not like Area Six developed as anything other than R-1

Sugar Land does not want multi-family in any form, no matter what classification

If anything other than R-1 is developed, then a PD situation is needed.

Wilson Hartman – 619 Main Street

Tract 3

Pecan Orchard development trees are being taken out

All wetlands need to be kept

Minimum of 500' greenbelt along each side of Oyster Creek

No commercial along State Highway 6 due to need for a natural buffer

Preservation of Imperial building

Single Family housing only

Areas equal to 25% of houses slab coverage should be dedicated as parkland

No access or commercial on Burney Road

Charlie Howard – State Representative; Owner of Area 6

- Not built within levee

- Storage tanks for oil

- Gas compressor station

- Pipelines and constraints

- Sewer treatment plant (original MUD reg)

- Want to convey that a specific plan is not in his mind at present

- Disappointed that Oilfield Road is not being considered in Thoroughfare Plan for improvement

Craig Brooks – 618 Rolling Mill

- Appreciates the public input process

- Preservation of Imperial Sugar Factory

- Maximum amount of greenbelt/parkland area and some to be natural areas

- Maximum amount of density being R-1

- Commercial areas to be on State Highway 6 except possible riverwalk area along Oyster Creek

- Implementation of some type of riverwalk park/retail/walking/waterside access

Paula Stansell - 35 Pembroke

Area Six

- Single family area works best with proposed Riverstone Development and traffic effects

Marty McHenry – 1227 Morning Mist; Misty Lakes area

- Believes that scenario 2 would be most favorable for economic development

- Density of development needs to take into account Burney Road

- Density of area to remain low

- Preserve Imperial Sugar Factory

- Low rise office, industrial not visible from residential would be best

- Greenbelts very important and riverwalk a very good idea

- Warehousing and distribution centers not very desirable due to traffic and limited opportunities for workforce

Marla Van Overbeke – 119 Main Street; The Hill

Tract 3

- Decisions will affect children's future

- Hope that development will not negatively affect Burney Road or quality of life in Sugar Land

Gary Kruger – Commonwealth Area

Area Six

Keep density down to R-1 - impacts of Riverstone or the overall area

Negative outlook of traffic

Concerns about Section 8 Housing – hope it is not true

Jim Jenkins – Newland Communities; Developer of Sugar Mill and President of Sugar

Mill Potential buyer of Tract 3

City of Sugar Land and staff are tough on developers and he agrees with that

Larry Loper – The Hill

Preservation of Imperial Property and Imperial Water Tower is very worthwhile

James Gomez – Mayfield Park area

Tract 3

What will happen with flooding for development on Tract 3 and will it affect drainage on Oyster Creek

Not really a shortage of single family homes